

**Dry Lake SEZ SRMP
Workshop 4, Feb 27, 2013
Questions for Stakeholders**

BLM's Draft Options for Costing

1. What are your thoughts on using a mitigation fee setting formula(s) based on restoration cost, ecological intactness, and conservation value?
2. Keeping in mind BLM wants to incentivize development in SEZs, is this an appropriate alternative to the conventional ratio-based habitat replacement approach? To conventional property valuation approach?
3. Using the proposed mitigation fee setting formula, what are appropriate thresholds/criteria for defining categories for: landscape condition? conservation values?
4. In the proposed mitigation fee setting formula, are the SEZ-specific and non-SEZ specific multiplier values/discount factors appropriate?
5. Should BLM subtract other required mitigation fees (e.g., county fees, tortoise mitigation fees) from the calculated fee? Inside of SEZs? In variance areas?
6. How can this formula be adapted to address other resource concerns (e.g., recreation, socioeconomic, grazing, cultural, visual)?
7. What is the threshold above which SEZ mitigation fees create a disincentive (e.g., when cost of developing on SEZ is more than on private lands)?

BLM Draft Options for Solar Mitigation Objectives and Priority Setting

1. Are there situations in which it is inappropriate to use an integrated mitigation goal versus a single-resource (stovepipe) mitigation goal?
2. Is mitigation for ecosystem intactness appropriate?
3. Setting aside legally-required mitigation, when is mitigation of a single resource necessary/appropriate/critical?

4. How do stakeholders view sequence of mitigation fee setting and candidate site selection? Which comes first and why?
5. Knowing that different mitigation action types (e.g., preservation, restoration, acquisition) imply different timelines, what criteria should the BLM consider in making its selection?
6. What information is needed for stakeholders to be able to provide candidate mitigation actions and/or sites early in the SEZ regional mitigation planning process?

Options for Mitigation Fee Structures and Holders

1. Are there any other funding structures or considerations that BLM should be aware of?
2. Do you agree that setting up a mitigation fee structure is an incentive that should only be provided for development in SEZs?
3. Is the cost-certainty associated with setting up a mitigation fee and the elimination of the hassle (i.e., costs) associated with permittee-responsible mitigation an incentive to go to SEZs?
4. Given the BLM's objectives for the Dry Lake SEZ, which funding structure or combination of funding structures do you think is most appropriate?
5. What fund holder characteristics are necessary or desired for the administration of mitigation funds for the Dry Lake SEZ?
6. What are the advantages/disadvantages of having a neutral 3rd party administering mitigation funds?